(Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

a back on a temporary basis. difference arises. There are [illegible] worked for six or seven years in the Food Department and who were retrenched. But it cannot be said they were thrown out because they were never on a permanent footing.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that some of these people who have served in the department for seven or eight years have been thrown out of job ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have already said that they were on a temporary basis and their services have been terminated. Nobody who was on a permanent footing has been sent out.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Is there any chance for these people to get into the department at any time ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—As far as possible their cases will be sympathetically considered and wherever a vacancy arises Government will try to see how far they can be fitted in.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Thank you, Sir.

Under-trial cases on the file of the First City Magistrate, Bangalore during the leave period of Sri D. R. Channarudriah, First City Magistrate.

Q.—230. Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) when Sri D. R. Channarudriah, First City Magistrate, Bangalore, has taken leave ;

(b) how long he was on leave ;

(c) whether any other person was appointed during the leave ;

(d) when he was appointed ;

(e) how many under-trial cases were on the file of the Magistrate during that leave period ?

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education) :—

(a) From 1st December 1952.

(b) From 1st December 1952 to 16th February 1953.

(c) Yes, some arrangements were made on 7th February 1953 but the orders were subsequently changed and revised orders issued on 16th February 1953.

(d) On 16th February 1953.

(e) Statement appended below.

Statement showing the particulars of the Custody Cases on the file of the City Magistrate's Court, Bangalore, from 1st December 1952.

Total Number of cases (Custody) instituted from 1st December 1952 to 10th March 1953	141
Number of cases (Custody) pending on 1st December 1952	104
Total ..	245
Number of cases disposed of ..	77
Pending on 10th March 1953..	168

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—With reference to the answer to (c) may I know what arrangements were made ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I request that the following corrections may be made : after "Yes" put a full stop. For "some" substitute "Permanent". The arrangements made were, Sri R. Nagaraj was in charge till permanent arrangements were completed. Between 7th and 16th February two Magistrates were appointed. On account of serious domestic difficulties they did not come. Therefore it was final.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—May I suggest that the officers transferred did not take office just because that office does not carry any allowance ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—That is a matter of opinion.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—Is it not but right that some allowance should be given to that office in view of the high cost of living in Bangalore?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—That is a matter under consideration.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—May I know why there has been such a long delay from 1st December to 16th February 1953 in transferring an officer to this office?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Exigencies of situation.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—With reference to the answer (*e*) may I suggest that these cases do not include the cases that have been transferred to the Court of Additional First Class Magistrate, Bangalore?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I want notice for that.

Enquiry by the High Court into the alleged complaints against the Second Magistrate of Ramanagaram.

Q.—293. Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether any complaint was made against the Second Magistrate of Ramanagaram during the calendar year 1952;

(*b*) if so, the nature and particulars of the complaint together with the names and descriptions of the complainants;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the complaint was entertained by the Law Minister and sent up to the High Court for inquiry;

(*d*) whether it is a fact that a High Court Judge proceeded to Ramanagaram to investigate the truth of the allegations made in the complaint;

(*e*) whether it is a fact that none of the various allegations made was substantiated on inquiry;

(*f*) whether it is a fact that the High Court Judge has suggested to the Government the desirability of prosecuting the complainants for making false charges against the Magistrate;

(*g*) whether any and if so, what action has been taken by Government in the matter?

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—(*a*) to (*g*) The matter is pending before the High Court of Mysore in certain Contempt of Court proceedings and the entire question is *sub judice*.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—May I know whether certain persons are found guilty by the High Court of Mysore for contempt of court, or whether the question is pending; whether a complaint was made against the magistrate?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The entire question is *sub judice*.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—May I submit with due respect to the Chair that the entire question cannot be *sub judice* because, unless a complaint has been received, it is a question of fact into the merits of which we need not go.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The matter is pending before the High Court.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—What prevents the Government from answering whether a complaint was received or not?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That means in other words a complaint has been received.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Do I take it that no supplementaries should be put?

Mr SPEAKER.—I feel so. Under rule 26 (*b*) it is desirable that I should not allow any supplementary questions.